

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/712,850	Applicant(s) DURDEN, DONALD L.	
	Examiner MISOOK YU	Art Unit 1642	

All Participants:

(1) MISOOK YU.

(2) DR. Kathleen Rigaut.

Date of Interview: 14 October 2008

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☒ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: *Rosenzweig et al., Clin Can Res, 1997 Jul;3(7):1149-56, the entire article, and abstracts of Sarkaria JN et al, and Yoshio et al., all three have been faxed to Dr. Rigaut's office either on 10/03/2008 or on 10/14/2008.*

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
art rejection of record in light of the three faxed references above

Claims discussed:
 122

Prior art documents discussed:
Rosenzweig et al., Clin Can Res, 1997 Jul;3(7):1149-56, and abstract of Sarkaria JN et al, and Yoshio et al

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
Amendment to new claim 122 discussed.

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)